

at least partially. As shown in Figure- 1, after the web is cut into discrete sheet along line 14, the sheet is also provided with weakened tear line 16 or 18 for separating the first area from the second area (figs. 2-4)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner's position. Applicant submits that Madole's Figures 1-4 distinguish clearly Madole's paper sheet from all of Applicant's amended claims which have the additional amended limitation "said first area extending to said top edge of said sheet perimeter and extending from one of said parallel side edges to the other of said parallel side edges" This amended limitation, which has been incorporated in all claims, including new renumbered claim 19, was discussed with Examiner in an office interview on January 23, 2001 in connection with overcoming the cited reference of Madole '833.

Examiner further refers to Column 4, lines 30-39 in Madole '833, stating:

"Madole teaches that the adhesive can be coated along its entire back surface or at least so much such that the pad can (be) secured to a supporting surface."

Again, applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner. Applicant submits that column 4, lines 30-39 in Madole '833 refer to the "final sheet S in the pad has repositional adhesive 38 coated along its entire back surface, or at least so much of its entire back surface as to permit the entire pad to be adhesively secured to a supporting surface 40, such as a wall." Applicant submits that Figure 5 and column 4, lines 30-39 distinguish clearly Madole's final sheet from all of Applicant's claims which have the limitation "said second area being located immediately adjacent to said first area and being substantially free from said adhesive coating . . ." For Examiner's convenience a copy of Column 4, lines 30-39 and Figures 1-5 are attached.

6. Examiner further rejected claims 13, 15 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madole, stating:

"Madole, as discussed above, fails to teach that the adhesive coated at least so much as to provide securement comprise "complete and continuous" covering. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Madole by providing a continuous and complete covering of adhesive in the first

area to provide for optimum adhesive securement based on optimization through routing experimentation."

Again, applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner. Applicant's first area, as described in all of applicant's claims extends "to said top edge of said sheet perimeter" whereas Madole's adhesive coated area, as shown in Figures 1-4 and as described in Column 3, lines 7-19, is inset from the top of the pad to define an uncoated strip 24 between the top margin of the pad and the strip of adhesive on the pad." For Examiner's convenience a copy of Column 3, lines 7-19 is attached.

7. Examiner also rejected claims 13, 15, and 19 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent 5,989,667. Applicant, hereby, in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321, files the attached Terminal Disclaimer. Applicant also represents that he is the sole owner of U.S. Patent 5,989,667 and the instant application.

9. In view of the above, applicant respectfully submits that claims 13, 15 and 19 are now believed to be allowable and passage to issuance is respectfully requested

10. If there remain any matters that may be resolved by telephone, the Examiner is invited to call applicant to resolve such matters.

Respectfully,



Amad Tayebi
Registration No. 46,461

5 Sequoia Road
Westford, MA 01886

Tel. (978) 692-7527 or (978) 934-3415